



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,418	01/05/2001	Jorge M. Ferreira	60001.0009US01	4805
27488	7590	04/28/2005	EXAMINER	
MICROSOFT CORPORATION C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C. P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			PAULA, CESAR B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/755,418

Applicant(s)

FERREIRA ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B. PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/10/05.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-12 and 14-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-12 and 14-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/05.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment, and IDS filed on 12/10/2005.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 4, and 13 have been canceled. Claim 27 has been added. Claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-27 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11, 19, and 21 are independent claims.

3. The rejection of claims 1-26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Grady et al. hereinafter Grady, Pub.No.: US 2001/0056463 A1 with priority filed on 06/20/02 have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment, and IDS.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The IDS filed on 12/10/2005 has been considered by the Examiner.

Drawings

5. The drawings filed on 1/5/2001 have been approved by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2178

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

6. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Star Office 5.1 Memorandum, and figs (published before 1/5/2001), from IDS submitted on 2/10/2005, hereinafter Staroffice.

Regarding independent claim 1, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an “Apply user data” checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*activating a privacy option comprising computer-implemented instructions*, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author’s name, from the properties of a file. The author’s name is replaced—*removal--* with more generic information, such as date and time of creation/modification—*replacing the one or more pieces of personal information with generic information without deleting the document* (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an “Apply user data” checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*saving the first document--*, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author’s name, from the properties of a file (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an “Apply user data” checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author’s name, from the properties of a file (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding dependent claim 5, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an “Apply user data” checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*saving the first document--*, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author’s name-- *generic information made up of string of letters--* from the properties of a file (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an “Apply user data” checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing and replacing—*removes one or more pieces of personal information from the first document--*, personal information, such as an author’s name, from the properties of a file (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an “Apply user data” checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*saving the first document removes one or more pieces of personal information from the first document when the first document is saved--*, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author’s name, from the properties of a file (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Staroffice teaches replacing or updating personal information, such as an author’s name, from the properties of a file (memorandum, shots 1-2).

In other words, the same document—*template--* is used to replace the updated information thereby creating a new or second document containing the updated information.

Art Unit: 2178

Claim 9 is directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claim 1, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 10 is directed towards a computer-readable medium having instructions for executing the steps found in claim 1, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding independent claim 11, Staroffice teaches the default selection of a “Apply user data” checkbox enabling the display of an author’s name *—receiving input of one or more pieces of personal information into one or more data storage fields in response to a request for personal information from a document-generating application--*. Software dialog is used for deselecting an “Apply user data” checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*activate a computer-implemented privacy option*, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author’s name, from the properties of a file. The author’s name is replaced—*removal--* with more generic information, such as date and time of creation/modification—*replacing the one or more pieces of personal information with generic information* (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Claims 12, 14-16 are directed towards a method equivalent to the steps found in claims 3, 5, 7, and 1 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claim 17 is directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claim 11, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claims 18-20 is directed towards a computer-readable medium having instructions for executing the steps found in claims 11, and 1-2 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an “Apply user data” checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*providing, and receiving input to activate a privacy option comprising computer-implemented instructions*, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author’s name, from the properties of a file. The author’s name is replaced with more generic information, such as date and time of creation/modification—*removal, and replacement of one or more pieces of personal information with generic information without deleting the document* (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Claims 22, and 24 are directed towards a method equivalent to the steps found in claim 2-3 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding dependent claim 23, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an “Apply user data” checkbox in a dialog box, and clicking Ok for changing—*provide a prompt to input instructions or personal information to activate the privacy option upon saving--* and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author’s name, from the properties of a file (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Claim 25 is directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claim 21, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 26 is directed towards a computer-readable medium having instructions for executing the steps found in claim 21, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding dependent claim 27, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an “Apply user data” checkbox in a dialog box, and clicking Ok for changing—*activating the privacy option enables removal of personal information from the comment box without removing the comment--* and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author’s name, from the properties of a file, which are displayed in a dialog box—*comment box--*(memorandum, shots 1-2).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Regarding claims 1, and 11, Applicants indicate that Grady does not anticipate the newly amended claims (page 9). The applicants are directed towards the new rejection above addressing the amended claims.

Regarding new claim 27, Applicants point out that “Nothing in Grady discloses a method whereby activating a privacy option removes personal information from a comment box without removing the comment itself” (page 10). The applicants are directed towards the new rejection of this claim.

Art Unit: 2178

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Habraken, J., StarOffice 5.2 Calc Handbook., Prentice Hall , 12/2000, Chapter 2.

8. Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 12/10/2005 prompted the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 609(B)(2)(i). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2178

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (703) 703-872-9306, (for all Formal communications intended for entry)


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

4/26/05